1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
3	THOMAS TURNER, on behalf of) himself and others similarly)
4	situated,) Civil Action
5	Plaintiffs) No. 20-11530-FDS
6	vs.)
7	LIBERTY MUTUAL RETIREMENT) BENEFIT PLAN; LIBERTY MUTUAL
8	MEDICAL PLAN; LIBERTY MUTUAL RETIREMENT BENEFIT PLAN RETIREMENT BOARD; LIBERTY
LO	MUTUAL GROUP INC., a Massachusetts
11	Company; LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY, a Massachusetts
12	Company; and, DOES 1-50, Inclusive,
13	Defendants
L4 L5	BEFORE: CHIEF JUDGE F. DENNIS SAYLOR, IV
L 6	TELEPHONIC STATUS CONFERENCE
L 7	
L 8	
L 9	John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse 1 Courthouse Way
20	Boston, MA 02210
21	
22	November 15, 2021 11:00 a.m.
23	Valerie A. O'Hara, FCRR, RPR
24	Official Court Reporter John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse
25	1 Courthouse Way Boston, MA 02210 E-mail: vaohara@gmail.com

1	APPEARANCES VIA TELEPHONE:
2	For The Plaintiffs:
3	Nicholas & Tomasevic, LLP, by ALEX M. TOMASEVIC, ESQ., 225 Broadway, 19th Floor, San Diego, California 92101;
4	Winters & Associates, JACK B. WINTERS, JR., ESQ., and
5	SARAH BALL, ATTORNEY, 8489 La Mesa Boulevard, La Mesa, California 91942;
6	Chang Law Group LLC, JEFF C. CHANG, ESQ.,
7	One Marina Park Drive, Suite 1410, Boston, Massachusetts 02210;
8	For the Defendants:
9	
10	McDermott Will & Emery LLP, by DMITRIY TISHYEVICH, ESQ., 340 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10173;
11	McDermott Will & Emery LLP, by SHAMIS N. BECKLEY, ESQ.,
12	and ANNABEL RODRIGUEZ, ATTORNEY, 200 Clarendon Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116-5021.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	<u>PROCEEDINGS</u>
2	THE CLERK: Court is now in session in the matter of
3	Turner vs. Liberty Mutual Retirement Benefit Plan, et al.,
4	Civil Action Number 20-11530.
5	Participants are reminded that photographing,
6	recording and rebroadcasting of this hearing is prohibited and
7	may result in sanctions.
8	Would counsel please identify themselves for the
9	record, starting with the plaintiff.
03:58РМ 10	MR. WINTERS: Jack Winters on behalf of the plaintiff.
11	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
12	MR. TOMASEVIC: Alex Tomasevic also on behalf of the
13	plaintiff.
14	MS. BALL: Sara Ball on behalf of plaintiff.
15	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
16	MR. CHANG: Jeff Chang on behalf of the plaintiff.
17	THE COURT: Good afternoon. For Liberty?
18	MR. TISHYEVICH: For defendants, this is
19	Dmitriy Tishyevich.
03:58РМ 20	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
21	MS. BECKLEY: Shamis Beckley for defendants as well.
22	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
23	MS. BECKLEY: Annabel Rodriguez for defendants.
24	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
25	MR. TISHYEVICH: And that's everyone on the

defendant's side.

03:59PM 20

03:59PM 10

THE COURT: All right. This is a status conference in this case. I have pending plaintiff's motion for discovery.

Do you want to be heard on that, Mr. Winters?

MR. WINTERS: You want me to address the merit, your Honor?

THE COURT: I'll give you an opportunity if you want. I can take it on the papers if you prefer.

MR. WINTERS: Your Honor, I'll be very quick. I think we believe we're entitled to the additional information necessary to properly evaluate which of the various SBDs are important for the court's consideration of the first cause of action, and we're just asking the court to apply the general rules of relevancy for that discovery. I want to make clear, we're not asking for anything beyond that, your Honor, for 2018, 2019.

THE COURT: Well, that doesn't seem to be what the record reflects. I mean, whether my decision was right or wrong, I thought I needed to decide upfront what was the operative plan or summary plan description, and I thought that's what the whole focus was going to be here, and it seems to me there's all kinds of requests in there for things that may be relevant you may be entitled to depending on how the litigation proceeds including, among other things, administrative record and all of that, but it doesn't seem to

me that your requests are really limited to what was the operative plan at the relevant time.

MR. WINTERS: Your Honor, if I may, the principal reason that the scope seems that way is that when we did make requests to Liberty for what they considered to be relevant, we got this list of documents. We got all of these documents from 2018, 2019, we even got documents from before discussions, all of the things that we raise in our motion have been produced by Liberty as relevant to this issue.

If they had just simply produced documents relevant to the amendment of the plan or the SBDs, perhaps we wouldn't be doing this, but, in fact, they produced hundreds of pages, which everything that we reference in our motion has been produced by Liberty, and perhaps that's where the confusion arises, but they think this is relevant to the issues that they requested discovery on, so we thought that when I say we want the rules of relevancy to apply, if they reference something, like a conversation with my client on the phone, for purposes of this determination, I should be able to see and listen to that conversation, and I don't need to argue any more with the court.

We're not trying to redo the court's order, I hope the court understands that.

THE COURT: Okay. Who is going to take the lead for Liberty in responding?

04:00PM 10

04:01PM 20

MR. TISHYEVICH: Dimitry, I'll be happy to. I'm not going to rehash our brief. I thought that the order from the July conference was fairly clear in terms of what discovery is allowed, which is not, we then got this laundry list of very wide ranging RFPs and objected to a number of them on that basis. We did agree to produce various documents that all are covered by the scope of your ruling, as I understood it, including what was the process for, you know, for the changes to the SBD, what notice was given to employees, like Mr. Turner, for those changes, et cetera.

And so we're somewhat confused on the SBDs. I think there are probably an e-mail or two that references Mr. Turner making some kind of complaint, and then further on in that document, there's discussion of, you know, updating or clarifying the SBD with potential follow-up.

So, in our view, that would be responsive, but I certainly don't think that opens up discovery to, well, now, gosh, we've got to produce, you know, every single complaint Mr. Turner has raised going back years, but I don't think that was contemplated by the scope of your ruling.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask you this, putting aside whatever you've claimed as privileged or redacted as privileged, as far as Liberty is concerned, have you produced everything concerning, I guess, let's say which is the operative SBD in 2019?

04:02PM 10

04:03PM 20

MR. TISHYEVICH: Yes, we've done a good faith search, and that was intended to get those documents, yes.

THE COURT: All right. And one of the reasons I'm concerned about additional delays, what I'd like to do is to get this issue one way or the other out of the way, and if the case is going to proceed, then, you know, we'll open it up to full discovery and get going, but I want to resolve this reasonably promptly, which leads to the question as far as Liberty is concerned, are you in a position where you could produce the 30(b)(6) witness to talk about these issues?

MR. TISHYEVICH: Oh, yes, in case that isn't clear, that deposition already took place.

THE COURT: Oh, it did.

MR. TISHYEVICH: It did, yes, on October 29th, but then the fact discovery as ordered, yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. TISHYEVICH: On the scheduling point, as I read plaintiff's reply that they filed a couple of hours ago, it doesn't sound like they're asking for the schedule to be changed, and neither is Liberty Mutual with summary judgment briefing, so it sounds like both sides are in alignment. It should proceed as scheduled.

THE COURT: Remind me what the next deadline is.

MR. TISHYEVICH: The renewed motions for summary judgment are due Monday, the 22nd, next Monday.

04:04PM 10

14

15

3

6

7

9

11

12

1.3

1617

18

19

04:04PM 20

22

21

2324

THE COURT: Next Monday, okay. All right. Do you want to reply, Mr. Winters?

1.3

04:06PM 20

04:05PM 10

MR. WINTERS: Yes, your Honor. We don't want to change (unintelligible). The 30(b)(6) deposition was taken on the last date of discovery. We just got the transcript, and we're not going to file any additional motions on it, but we believe the same issues that we had raised in our motion occurred during the 30(b)(6) deposition. I don't want -- our silence is that we still need to be meet and confer on that. I thought frankly that would be done in conjunction with what we are just talking about today or whenever, so we're fine with keeping the schedule going, your Honor. There may be issues with the 30(b)(6). We don't need to discuss that today.

THE COURT: All right. Here's what I'm going to do.

I'm going to deny the motion for discovery without prejudice.

That is Document Number 64, Docket Number 64. When I say without prejudice, that is obviously, assuming the case survives what appears to be another round of summary judgment or a round of summary judgment, it may well be that many, if not all of these requests, may prove to be irrelevant. We can take that up in due course.

Not having read the 30(b)(6) deposition, obviously, and not quite having perhaps a full grasp on the issues, it's possible that I may discover as we get into this process that, you know, in fact, plaintiffs may be entitled to something else

on this, on the narrow issue, and, if so, we'll take that up in due course, but it seems to me that as near as I can make out, that sufficient information has been produced from which I can ascertain on summary judgment what was the relevant summary plan description and then ascertain what it said and ascertain whether or not that defeats the plaintiff's claim or not, and we'll take it from there, so I'm going to deny it without prejudice.

Oh, and the other piece of it, of course, is I have not done an in-camera privilege review on the matters, on the privilege log, and it's possible that should such a procedure be necessary that that conceivably could also result in additional discovery.

So, hold on. Let me look at the docket here. So the current timetable calls for reply memorandum filed by January 6th, and did I put in a date for the hearing? I don't think I did. Matt, can you give me a date somewhere, January 8th, 10th, 12th, some time in that time frame for oral argument on the motion?

THE CLERK: How about Wednesday, January 12th at 2 p.m.?

THE COURT: Wednesday, January 12th at 2 p.m., and as much as I would like to force someone from Southern California to come to Boston in the middle of the winter, I think we can do that by Zoom. Is that all right with you, Mr. Winters?

04:07PM 10

04:08PM 20

MR. WINTERS: I like Boston, your Honor. That's fine. THE COURT: Well, it's nicer in June than in January. MR. WINTERS: Well, it's a great place, your Honor. THE COURT: Wednesday, January 12th, 2 p.m. oral argument on summary judgments, and we'll do that by Zoom. All right. Anything else? MR. TISHYEVICH: Nothing for Liberty. MR. WINTERS: Thank you. (Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 4:09 p.m.)

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT)
4	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS) ss.
5	CITY OF BOSTON)
6	
7	I do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript,
8	Pages 1 through 11 inclusive, was recorded by me
9	stenographically at the time and place aforesaid in Civil
10	Action No. 20-11530-FDS, THOMAS TURNER, on behalf of himself
11	and others similarly situated vs. LIBERTY MUTUAL RETIREMENT
12	BENEFIT PLAN; LIBERTY MUTUAL MEDICAL PLAN; LIBERTY MUTUAL
13	RETIREMENT BENEFIT PLAN RETIREMENT BOARD; LIBERTY
14	MUTUAL GROUP INC., a Massachusetts Company; LIBERTY MUTUAL
15	INSURANCE COMPANY, a Massachusetts Company; and, DOES 1-50,
16	Inclusive, and thereafter by me reduced to typewriting and is a
17	true and accurate record of the proceedings.
18	Dated December 6, 2022.
19	
20	s/s Valerie A. O'Hara
21	
22	VALERIE A. O'HARA
23	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
24	
25	